

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 10, 2004, the Examiner objected to claims 3, 7, and 8 for informalities. See Office Action, pg. 2. The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. See Office Action, pg. 2. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,439,897 to Ikeya (hereinafter, "Ikeya") and rejected claims 2, 4, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by 'the admitted prior art.'" See Office Action, pgs. 2-4. The Examiner also indicated that claims 7 and 8 "would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph . . . and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all the intervening claims." See Office Action, pg. 4

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-3, 5, and 7-9 to more appropriately define the present invention and add new claims 13-16, wherein claims 13 and 14 incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 7 and 8, respectively, in independent claim form.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS 3, 7, AND 8

Claims 3, 7, and 8 have been amended to overcome the objections by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to overcome this rejection by the Examiner. Claims 7 and 8 now recite that the “sinking-amount adjustment includes at least one convex seat portion.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. If the prior art reference does not expressly set forth a particular element of the claim, that reference still may anticipate if that element is inherent in its disclosure. To establish inherency, the Office must show that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. (See M.P.E.P § 2131 (8th ed. 2001)).

Rejection of Claims 1 and 9-12 over Ikeya

Ikeya discloses a socket apparatus for removably mounting electronic packages using a “flexible contact sheet or film as a contact interface member.” Ikeya, col. 1, ll. 11-12. Specifically, Ikeya employs “a plurality of spring contact elements 15, capable of contacting the plate part 14b1 of each contact 14b of the contact film.” Ikeya, col. 4, ll. 39-41. “Spring contact elements 15 are compression coil springs” Ikeya, col. 4, 43-44. Thus, spring contact elements 15 move up and down vertically to engage the contacts of the contact sheet.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that the claimed "movement-amount controlling member," is disclosed by the spring contact elements 15 of Ikeya. Applicants respectfully disagree. Spring contact elements 15 are springs that move vertically in response to the pressure provided by the semiconductor package contacts on the contacts located on the contact film. However, spring contact elements 15 are provided directly underneath each contact of the contact film and not "disposed on top of said contact sheet" as required by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 9 contains similar recitations as claim 1 including that a "movement-amount restricting member is disposed on top of said contact sheet." Because Ikeya fails to disclose at least this recitation for the reasons set forth for the allowability of claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 9. In addition, based on at least their dependency upon allowable independent claim 9, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 10-12.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 over Ikeya

The Examiner alleges that the claimed "contact sheet pressing member" of claim 2 is disclosed by an engagement part 30a. However, Ikeya discloses an invention relating to a socket apparatus in which movement of a compression member 30 away from cover 20 is limited by an engagement part 30a formed at a side of compression member 30. Ikeya, col. 5, ll. 55-58. When the compression member 30 presses a package 2, an engagement part 30a is not engaged with an engagement part 20a of the cover 20 as shown in Fig. 1 and does not press contact film 14 in the direction in which

the sinking of the contact film 14 in the vicinity of the group is restricted. Thus, the engagement part 30a does not “engage[s] the contact sheet,” as required by claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 2, as well as claim 3 based on at least its dependency upon allowable independent claim 2.

With respect to claim 5, the Examiner alleges that contact film receiving section 12a discloses the claimed “sinking-amount adjustment section,” of claim 5. Contact film receiving section 12a is “recessed” and “is formed to be lower than the top surface of support member 12 by a depth somewhat greater than the thickness of the interface contact film 14.” Ikeya, col. 4, ll. 16-21. However, because of its recessed nature, contact film receiving section 12 has not capacity to “compensate” for the sinking of any bump group and does not “apply a force in a direction opposite to the sinking,” as required by claim 5. Therefore, Ikeya does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, all the elements of claim 5 including at least “a sinking-amount adjustment section . . . for compensating an amount of sinking of said bump group by applying a force in a direction opposite to the sinking . . . ,” as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 5.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 6 over the Admitted Prior Art

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner alleges that Applicants' admitted prior art (Fig. 20) discloses all the elements of claim 2, including at least that pressing body 16 discloses the claimed “contact sheet pressing member.” See Office Action, pg. 4. As shown in Fig. 20, however, pressing body 16 does not “engage[s] the contact sheet,”

as is required by claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 2. Further, based on at least its dependency upon allowable claim 2, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 4.

With respect to claim 5, the Examiner alleges that Applicants' admitted prior art (Fig. 20) discloses all the elements of claim 5, including at least that "a depression in the base for elastic sheet (4)" discloses the claimed "sinking-amount adjustment section." See Office Action, pg. 4. As shown in Fig. 20, however, the recess for elastic sheet 4 does not have any "sinking-amount adjustment section . . . for compensating an amount of sinking of said bump group by applying a force in a direction opposite to the sinking . . . ," as is recited in claim 5. Instead, the recess is uniform in depth with no capacity to "compensate" for the sinking of any bump group. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 5. Further, based on at least its dependency upon allowable claim 5, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 6.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 13 and 14 have been added to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 7 and 8 and are written to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 are in immediate condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims 1-16.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 10, 2004

By: 

John M. Romary
Reg. No. 26,331